

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-12, 14-24, 26-33 and 38-40 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 3, 13, 25 and 34-37 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 19, 29 and 32 are amended as shown on pp. 2-7 of the Reply. Claim 40 is newly added. Support for the amendments and new claim may be found, for example, in the claims as originally filed and in paragraphs [0054]-[0074].

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Claim Objection

Withdrawal of the objection to claim 32 is respectfully requested in view of the amendment to claim 32 set forth above.

II. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4-33 and 39 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1, 2, 4-33 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to nonstatutory subject matter. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the amendments set forth above.

III. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4-33, 38 and 39 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 4-33, 38 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Demsey et al. (US 20040098731) (“Demsey”). Claims 13 and 25 have been canceled.

The rejection of the remaining claims is respectfully traversed. As to independent claim 1, Demsey does not support the rejection for at least the reason that Demsey fails to disclose “the source notifies a native layer that an event handler has attached or detached,” as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action alleges that Demsey discloses the noted features at paragraphs [0018], [0047]-[0048] and [0061]-[0072] (Office Action, p. 10, lines 11-13). However, the cited portions of Demsey merely describe notifications across a VM/native layer boundary. Although some notifications relate to “events” (par. [0047]), there is no mention of a source notifying a native layer that an event handler has attached or detached, as required by claim 1. Accordingly,

claim 1 is allowable over Demsey, as are claims 2, 4-12 and 14-18 for at least the reason that they depend on claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite.

As to independent claim 19, Demsey does not support the rejection for at least the reason that Demsey fails to disclose “the filter component is notified by the managed code framework when an event handler has at least one of registered and unregistered from a managed object, and forwards the one or more responses only when the associated event handlers are registered,” as recited in claim 19.

As with claim 1, Office Action relies on Demsey at paragraphs [0018], [0047]-[0048] and [0061]-[0072] in support of the rejection of claim 19 (Office Action, p. 13, lines 13-18). However, along lines discussed previously, the cited portions of Demsey merely relate to notifications and are silent with respect to at least the noted features of claim 19.

Claim 19 is therefore allowable over Demsey, as are claims 20-24 and 26-28 for at least the reason that they depend on claim 19, as well as for the additional features they recite.

Independent claim 29 recites “the source notifies a native layer that an event handler has attached or detached,” and consequently is allowable over Demsey for at least reasons discussed previously in connection with claim 1. Claims 30 and 31 are likewise allowable over Demsey for at least the reason that they depend on claim 29, as well as for the additional features they recite.

As to independent claim 32, Demsey does not support the rejection for at least the reason that Demsey fails to disclose or suggest “registering an event handler for an event of a managed object,” “notifying the native code that the event handler is registered,” and “transmitting the relevant responses across the interface to the managed code only when the associated event handler is registered,” as recited in claim 32.

The Office Action relies on Demsey at paragraphs [0016]-[0019], [0021], [0034]-[0036], [0047]-[0048] and [0061]-[0072] in support of the rejection (Office Action, p. 16, lines 3-6 and 12-14). However, Demsey is deficient. As discussed previously, the cited portions of Demsey relate mainly to notifications. While paragraph [0036] does mention an event handler, Demsey is silent concerning the operations associated with an event handler recited in claim 32. Accordingly, claim 32 is allowable over Demsey, as is claim 33 for at least the reason that it depends on claim 32, as well as for the additional features it recites.

Independent claim 38 recites substantially the same features as does claim 32, in means-plus-function form, and consequently is likewise allowable over Demsey. Claim 39 is likewise allowable for at least the reason that it depends on claim 38, as well as for the additional features it recites.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is respectfully reminded that Demsey is ineligible as a reference under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), in view of §103(c), for at least the reason that Demsey and the present application have a common assignee (Microsoft Corporation).

IV. New Claim

New claim 40 is clearly allowable over the art of record. None of the art of record discloses or suggests a method of managing messages across a performance-based interface, comprising using one or more processors to perform the following computer-executable acts: receiving the performance-based interface between a managed code and a native code, registering an event handler for an event of a managed object, notifying the native code that the event handler is registered, returning one or more responses of the native code associated with the event, filtering the one or more responses of the native code to determine the relevant responses associated with event, transmitting the relevant responses across the interface to the managed code only when the associated event handler is registered, processing a request, issued by an application, associated with the event in accordance with a destination process, unregistering the event, notifying an event filter that the event is unregistered, and signaling the application that the event has been unregistered, as required by the combination of features in new claim 40 and claim 32, on which claim 40 depends.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP571US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROC & CALVIN, LLP

/William E. Curry/

William E. Curry

Reg. No. 43,572

AMIN, TUROC & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731